



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,373	09/30/2003	Stefan Jesse	13913-107001 / 2003P00322	3224
32864	7590	10/02/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			VU, TUAN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,373

Applicant(s)

JESSE ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan A. Vu

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/30/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the application filed 9/30/2003.

Claims 1-22 have been submitted for examination.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 8, 18 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 4, 12, 19 of copending Application No. 10,676,374 (hereinafter '374).

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following example of conflicting claims.

As per instant claim 8, copending '374 claim 4 recites a first data model being used to derive an API and employing the API to access development objects. But '374 claim 4 does not

Art Unit: 2193

explicitly recite (i) object model to structure development objects; (ii) generate intermediate objects therefrom and (iii) base on the set of intermediate objects and a code template to generate the API, the model including (iv) a language extension used to implement a feature of the API such as an indication of a file border.

However, '374 claim 4 recites a variation of the language teaching limitations (i) and (ii) via the recital of 'defining file borders comprising identifying of development objects to be included in a file ... in the data model ... to be children of the main ... object that are not identified as main...objects', the intermediate objects being added objects to the file of the main object including development objects defined in the data model. As for the template code (iii), '374 claim 4 includes file storing user-defined code associated with the main development object; and for one skill in the art, having a template file (see '374 claim 4) for user to define code for a development as purported by '374 claim 3 would be equivalent to (iii), thus disclosed or otherwise obvious. As for the feature extension comprising a file border indication referred to as (iv), this is suggested in '374 reciting of 'defining file borders for development', and storing development objects in a repository based on the file borders, and accessing these objects via the API (*); so that one skill in the art would be motivated to provide an extension structure obtained from the repository (e.g. template builder) in the course of the API derivation with utilizing of information in the '374 stored file-based repository for the derivation. That is, the information thus extended (e.g. via a template builder) from the stored model/repository regarding a particular file border identity would be used to support the creation of API parameter or attributes which would be needed to access the very components stored from the '374 defining of file borders, as purported by the endeavor described as (*) from the above.

As per instant claim 18, '374 claims 12 and 19 also recite an analogous language expressing receiving in a development method a data model (being generated, repository storing development in a data model), deriving a API based thereon; and use the API to perform operations on a development object (e.g. API incorporating the feature defined by the model customizable extension during development of the application; OR API to access development objects).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 7, 8, 11 are objected to because of the following informalities: There appear to be some typographical mistakes in the reciting of numerals corresponding to claim dependency; that is, claim 7 should depend on claim 6 (not on mistyped claim 5 as recited); claim 8 should depend on claim 7 (not on claim 6 as mistyped); and claim 11 should depend on claim 10 (not on claim 1 as recited).

5. Claims 21-22 recite a 'delete'; and this appear to be a grammatical informality; i.e. this *delete* should be corrected for it to stand for a noun, e.g. a 'delete' command.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2193

7. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "modifying the transient object" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

That is, claim 20 recites 'creating a new ... object without an existing corresponding file as a transient object', and 'modifying the transient object ...'. This claim does not appear to convincingly establish the existence of a 'transient object' as a result of the 'creating a new ...object' limitation in order to enable the 'modifying the transient object' step to realize. One skill in the art would not be able to construe how the 'modifying' can be done when there is no creation of the transient object. Based on the teaching of the disclosure, the step of creating as recited should be adjusted. For example, the phrase 'without an existing ... file as a transient object' should put forth the fact of creating an object as a transient object being prior to (emphasis added) the requirement specifying on the existing corresponding file. The transient object will be treated as the new object being created.

Claims 21-22 are also rejected for not remedying to this deficiency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho et al., USPN: 6,964,053 (hereinafter Ho).

As per claim 1, Ho discloses a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for developing an application, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

receive a first data model in a first language (*Rose* documents – col. 10, lines 19-29; *Rose* File 601- Fig. 6), the data model being used to structure development objects;

generate a set of intermediate objects based on the first data model (DTD, schema 605 – Fig. 6; Fig. 8; *metamodel files*, *DTD files* col. 11, lines 56 -58); and

based on the set of intermediate objects and a code template (e.g. Fig. 4; Fig. 8; *template* - col. 15, lines 44 to col. 16, line 26), generate an API to access the development objects (e.g. Fig. 3-4; *connector* - col. 9, lines 25-29; *API* -col. 13, lines 9-20; col. 14, lines 29-67 – Note: metamodel languages and descriptor metamodel files used to generate a common Connector metamodel reads on one API – see Fig. 4, Application Interface metamodel - Fig. 7).

As per claims 2-4, Ho discloses instructions to convert the first data model to a second data model in a second language, wherein the set of intermediate objects is based on the second data model (e.g. *generate a DTD ... XML documents of the application source files* - col. 11, lines 13-24; *DTD, schema 605* – Fig. 6; col. 11, lines 56 -58); wherein the second language comprises XML and the first language comprises UML (col. 11, lines 13-24).

As per claim 5, Ho discloses wherein the set of intermediate objects comprises Java objects (e.g. Java code 609 – Fig. 6; Fig. 8-19).

As per claims 6-8, Ho discloses wherein the first language comprises a customizable extension; wherein the customizable extension is used to implement an additional feature of the API, wherein the additional feature comprises an indication of a file border (Fig. 9-10; col. 14, line 58 to col. 15 line 42 – Note: customizing of interface to fulfill requests for data translation based on runtime read of *metamodel files* based on construct neutral structures to facilitate language translation – see col. 15, lines 21-29-- to appropriate platform reads on customizable runtime extension; and type descriptor files to support Java, cobol or IMS to enable customization of connector implementation read on model extension – see Fig. 3-4 – with indication pointing to file borders – or descriptor files).

As per claim 9, Ho discloses wherein the API comprises a copy and paste operation (e.g. Fig. 2; Fig. 16-17 – Note: customization from user interface to create instance of metamodel connector to comply to a specific platform request reads on editing capabilities of developer – see *Integration runtime 221*, Fig. 2; while requests based on said created connector or SAX – see col. 9, lines 13-29 – being real time event-based should read on user capability of modifying screen content – see col. 37, lines 11-39; col. 38, lines 8-65, hence copy and paste).

As per claim 10, Ho discloses a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for developing an application, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

receive a first data model in a first language, the data model being used to structure development objects (e.g. *Rose* documents – col. 10, lines 19-29; *Rose File 601*- Fig. 6);

generate a set of intermediate objects based on the first data model; and based on the set of intermediate objects and a schema template (e.g. source 507 – Fig. 5; col. 11, lines 13-24; Fig.

Art Unit: 2193

4; *XMI instance* - Fig. 6, 8 – Note: XMI instance reads on intermediate objects and template leading to constructing a DTD or XML schema),

generate an XML schema (e.g. *DTD, schema 605* – Fig. 6; col. 11, lines 56 –58; XML 511, Fig. 5) used to implement the development objects.

As per claims 11-14, refer to the corresponding rejection as set forth in claims 2-5.

As per claims 15-16, Ho discloses wherein the XML schema includes a tree based on aggregation relationships in the first data model; wherein the XML schema includes a reference based on an association relationship in the first data model (e.g. col. 11, lines 13-24, lines 56-58).

As per claim 17, Ho discloses wherein the XML schema includes a complex type extension based on an inheritance relationship in the first data model (e.g. Fig. 3-5; Fig. 6; *TypeDescriptor Metamodel* Fig. 9-10; *inheritance* -col. 15, lines 43-67; col. 23, lines 6-54 – Note: creating of schema for repository of Rose files to identify typedescriptor metamodel files reads in schema including indication pointing to complex type extension – see cols. 14-16 for runtime marshalling/transformation as purported in Fig. 3 integration environment).

As per claim 18, Ho discloses a computer program product, tangibly embodied in an information carrier, for developing an application, the computer program product being operable to cause data processing apparatus to:

receive a first data model;

derive an API based on the data model; and

use the API to perform operations on a development object;

all of which limitations having been addressed in claim 1.

As per claim 19, Ho discloses wherein the API (Fig. 3-4) comprises an interface layer, a proxy layer (e.g. API, proxy – col. 9, lines 13-42), and a state layer (e.g. *SimpleInstanceTD* – Fig. 10B; *InstanceTDBase* – Fig. 12-13).

As per claim 20, Ho discloses wherein the operations comprise creating a new development object (e.g. Interface Metamodel 707 - Fig. 6-7; Figs. 12-13 and related instantiation of objects for a generic model placeholder – see col. 23, lines 6-54) without an existing corresponding file as a transient object; and modifying the transient object until the transient object is committed to a persistent file (e.g. *Upperbounds*, *Alignment requirements*, *Platform compiler Type*, *validity checking* -cols 24-36; Fig. 16 – Note: validity checking or bounds checking for instance of Enumeration objects reads on modifying until an object is ready for being compiled into target platform).

As per claims 21-22, Ho discloses comprising instructions to destroy the transient object if a delete is requested before the transient object is committed to a persistent file; and to mark the persistent file as deleted if a delete is requested after the transient object is committed to a persistent file (e.g. *commit* – col. 13, lines 60 to col. 14, line 9; *...returned to the manufacturer's server* - col. 37, lines 4-57; *track changes*, *mark annotations* – col. 38, lines 19-65 – Note: complex operations involving data invocations via servers, suppliers or manufacturing sites with a *commit* for any received messages or not accepting incompatible set of (platform) data at the user editing interface – or conference/authoring level - **read on** transient object marked for delete before it gets persisted at manufacturing site or vendor supply chain).

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2193

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan A Vu whose telephone number is (272) 272-3735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-4:30PM/Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571)272-3719.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-3735 (for non-official correspondence - please consult Examiner before using) or 571-273-8300 (for official correspondence) or redirected to customer service at 571-272-3609.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Tuan A Vu
Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2193
September 28, 2006